



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/730,247	12/08/2003	Vaughn T. Rokosz	LOT920030053US1	2509
23550	7590	07/10/2007	EXAMINER	
HOFFMAN WARNICK & D'ALESSANDRO, LLC			WONG, LUT	
75 STATE STREET			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
14TH FLOOR			2129	
ALBANY, NY 12207			MAIL DATE	
			07/10/2007	
			DELIVERY MODE	
			PAPER	

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/730,247	ROKOSZ ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Lut Wong	2129	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### **Status**

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 April 2007.  
 2a) This action is **FINAL**.      2b) This action is non-final.  
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### **Disposition of Claims**

4) Claim(s) 1 and 4-22 is/are pending in the application.  
 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
 6) Claim(s) 1, 4-22 is/are rejected.  
 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### **Application Papers**

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### **Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### **Attachment(s)**

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application  
 6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## **DETAILED ACTION**

This office action is responsive to an RCE AMENDMENT entered April 19, 2007 for the patent application 10730247

The Final Office Action of Jan 19, 2007 is fully incorporated into this Final Office Action by reference.

### ***Status of Claims***

Claims 1, 4-22 are pending. Claim 2 has been cancelled. Claims 1, 8, 13, 18 have been amended.

### ***Response to Arguments***

In re pg. 9, Applicant's arguments with respect to 101 rejections have been fully considered and are persuasive. The rejections have been withdrawn.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

**Claims 1, 4-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to**

**reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.**

Claims 1, 8, 13, 18 have been amended, but no support has been provided for the limitation “wherein at least one of the desired interactivity metrics provided by the potential user measures an interactivity between users unrelated to a content of information posted in the collaborative space.”

Claims 1, 8, 13, 18 recites “categorizing the collaborative space into a group based on the interactivity metrics, wherein the group identifies a subset of collaborative spaces from a set of collaborative spaces”. Applicant’s disclosure [0035] does support categorizing into group. However, there in no citations of the group is a subset.

### ***Response to Arguments***

In re pg. 9, Applicant’s arguments have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In particular, applicant submits that paragraphs 0026 and 0027 of the original disclosure provide support for the limitation “wherein at least one of the desired interactivity metrics provided by the potential user measures an interactivity between users unrelated to a content of information posted in the collaborative space.”

In response, the example in [0026] only suggests the invention can search for a collaborative space based on specific reason. It does not follow that the collaborative space recommended must have a content “unrelated” to the potential user. [0026] also mention “Under the present invention collaborative space 12 are analyzed based on

interactivity metrics between current users 16 thereof". Again, there is no suggestion/teaching of "unrelated" in the phrase. Hence, one cannot conclude from that with the limitation "The metrics measures an interactivity between users unrelated to a content of information posted in the collaborative space"

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

**Claims 1, 4-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipates by**

**Netscan (<http://web.archive.org/web/20021001103129/netscan.research.microsoft.com/Static/Default.asp>)**  
**for reason of record, as set forth in previous office action.**

***Response to Arguments***

In re pg. 10, applicant argues that Netscan fails to group and identify a subset of collaborative space.

In response, see the 112 first paragraph rejection above. Assuming applicant does have support for such limitation, Netscan still anticipates such limitation for at least the following reason:

1) the term "subset" does not exclude the full set. See e.g., the definition by answers.com: "If A and B are sets and every element of A is also an element of B, then:

A is a subset of (or is included in) B". Hence, by re-ranking the newsgroups by interactivity metric, it still returns a subset of the newsgroup.

2) Not all re-ranked newsgroups are displayed in the browser, only a portion are displayed and the user is required to scroll down in order to see the rest. Having done so, it is non-functionally distinct from applicant's claimed method. Both display only a portion of recommended newsgroup.

3) Applicant is recommend to test out Netscan at  
<http://netscan.research.microsoft.com/Default.aspx>

### Conclusion

All claims are drawn to the same invention claimed in the application prior to the entry of the submission under 37 CFR 1.114 and could have been finally rejected on the grounds and art of record in the next Office action if they had been entered in the application prior to entry under 37 CFR 1.114. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL** even though it is a first action after the filing of a request for continued examination and the submission under 37 CFR 1.114. See MPEP § 706.07(b).

Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lut Wong whose telephone number is (571) 270-1123. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:30-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vincent David can be reached on (571) 272-3080. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Lut Wong/  
Patent Examiner, AU 2129

*David Vincent* 3/1/07  
DAVID VINCENT  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER